

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/539,884	YAMAGUCHI ET AL.
	Examiner DIMPLE N. BODAWALA	Art Unit 1791

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): *DS* *8-25-08*

(1) Dimple Bodawala (Examiner) *DB*

(3) James Armstrong (Applicant's representative)

(2) Philip Tucker (SPE) *PT*

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 25 August 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: JP(2002-302795); Kataoka et al. (US 5,866,025); Iwasaki et al. (US 2002/0109134); Hisamoto et al. (US 6,444,304); and Hisamoto et al. (US 6,066,392).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: (See attached sheet).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

During the interview, Applicant's representative proposed new amendment to the claim 1 of the instant application to overcome the rejection of claims over the prior arts.

Applicant representative and examiners discussed the prior arts, JP (2002-302795); Kataoka et al. (US 5,866,025); and Iwasaki et al. (US 2002/0109134. Applicant's representative further argues that the prior art JP (2002-302795) fails to teach or suggest dimension of pores in the coating. This is not found persuasive because the prior art teaches the diameter of pores; depth of pores and thickness of coating.

During the interview Applicant's representative proposed amendment to claim 1 which indicates 85 % or more of pores in the coating. Applicant argues that no reference teach that the coating having a 85 % or more of pores in the coating. It was pointed out that the secondary art, Kataoka et al. (US 5,866,025) teaches that the coating having a large number of pores, wherein number of pores is depended on the diameter of pores in coating.

During the interview Examiner suggested that the unit of the tensile strength is not proper. No agreement is reached at this point.

/D. N. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 1791